



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/657,956	09/08/2000	Eva Prpic	JP920000170US1	1771

7590 04/14/2004  
International Business Machines Corporation  
Almaden Research Center  
650 Harry Road  
San Jose, CA 95120

EXAMINER

ZHONG, CHAD

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2154

DATE MAILED: 04/14/2004

7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/657,956

Applicant(s)

PRPIC ET AL.

Examiner

Chad Zhong

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 March 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

**FINAL ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment, filed on 3/19/2004. This action has been made final.

2. Claims 1-10 are presented for examination. In amendment A, filed on 3/19/2004:

Claims 1-8 are amended.

Claims 9-10 are newly added.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, second paragraph***

3. Claims 2-4, 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

a. The following terms lack antecedent basis:

i. said Immigration Authority – claim 3.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by “Fairfield Ponte Vedra Decals and Access Cards” (hereinafter Fairfield), 17 June, 1998, in view of ‘Official Notice’

6. As per claims 1 and 5, Fairfield teaches a method of accrediting participants to an event, said

Art Unit: 2154

method comprising the steps of:

- a) collecting information from each of said participants (pg 1, lines 13-14);
- b) recording the information in an accreditation system (pg 1, lines 13-15, lines 30-31);
- c) producing a non-valid pass for each of said participants (pg 1, lines 13-14, lines 18-26, lines 30-31);
- d) issuing the respective non-valid passes to said participants (pg 1, line 14);
- e) upon arrival of such a participant at, or proximate an event venue, validating said non-valid pass for the participant, thereby accrediting said participant (pg 1, lines 11-12, lines 30-31, lines 18-27), wherein step e) includes the steps of:

updating an accreditation status of the participant in the accreditation system (pg 1, lines 28-32).

7. Fairfield does not teach securing the pass in a security pouch, However 'Official Notice' is taken by the Examiner that both the concept and advantages of providing for a security pouch is well known and expected in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include a security pouch with Fairfield because it would provide for protection against elements as well as external tampering of the pass.

8. As per claim 2, Fairfield teaches the method of claim 1, comprising the further step of:  
upon arrival of each participant, verifying information of said participant before said non-valid pass is validated (pg 1, lines 11-12, lines 30-31).

9. As per claims 4 and 7, Fairfield teaches ascribing an accreditation class to each of said participants; and ascribing privileges to each of said accreditation classes (pg 1).

10. As per claim 8, Fairfield does not teach wherein said system is a distributed system comprising interconnected servers and workstations. However, "Official Notice" is taken by the

examiner that both the concept and advantages of providing for a security pouch is well known and expected in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention to include a series of servers and workstations in a distributed manner because doing so would provide efficiency for the Immigration's system, operating as an automated network oriented architecture.

11. As per claim 9 and 10, Fairfield teaches wherein the non-valid passes issued to the participants form a first portion of a valid pass (pg 1, lines 9-15) and the participants are associated with organizations, and wherein the method of comprises the steps of:

producing non-valid passes by the accreditation system for said organizations (pg 1, lines 18-32; pg 2, lines 13-25), wherein such a non-valid pass for an organization forms a second portion of a valid pass; and

issuing the non-valid passes to said organizations, so that the organizations may distribute the second portions to selected ones of the participants associated with the respective organizations, wherein the validating in step e) uses both the first and second portions of the pass (pg 1, lines 27-32, lines 33-42, lines 18-32).

12. Claims 3 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "Fairfield Ponte Vedra Decals and Access Cards" (hereinafter Fairfield), 17 June, 1998, in view of De La Rue "Angolan National Identity Solution" (hereinafter De la Rue), 1999.

13. As per claims 3 and 6, Fairfield teaches the method for foreign participants and before arrival of participants, sending a bulk request to an Authority (pg 2, lines 16-21), and receiving a status from said department, allowing said validated pass to serve as a form of entry (pg 1, lines 30-31).

14. Fairfield does not teach sending a visa request to immigration authority and receiving a visa status from said immigration department, allowing said validated pass to serve as a visa.

15. De la Rue teaches wherein sending a visa request to immigration authority and receiving a visa status from said immigration department, allowing said validated pass to serve as a visa (paragraph 1-3).

16. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention was made to combine the teaching of Fairfield and De la Rue because they both dealing with validation process prior to entry to an area. Furthermore, the teaching of De la Rue to sending a visa request to immigration authority and receiving a visa status from said immigration department, allowing said validated pass to serve as a visa would expand the functionality for Fairfield's system by expanding the authentication and validation technique at the immigration check points.

#### *Conclusion*

17. Applicant's remarks filed 3/19/2004 have been considered but are found not persuasive in view at the new grounds at rejection necessitated by Applicant's amendment.

18. In the remark, the applicant argued in substance that Fairfield fails to disclose or suggest passes issued to the participants are non-valid upon issuance for claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 7.

In response to applicant's amendment, Fairfield does teach passes issued to the participants are non-valid passes upon issuance.

Referring to page 1, lines 5-8, lines 28-32, lines 40-42, Fairfield teaches the notion of issuing passes and validating them at the gate/terminal, through the sections cited above, the pass is only validated (check for validity, to make valid) when users enters the gate, furthermore, Fairfield goes to teach that a non-participant using a participant's card will result in invalidation/access denied, leading to appropriate security measures. Thus by the notion above, the initial pass issued to the participants is non-valid, to be validated to be of further usage.

Art Unit: 2154

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reined of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The following patents and publications are cited to further show the state of the art with respect to "Accreditation of Personnel".

- |       |              |                  |
|-------|--------------|------------------|
| i.    | US 6,035,280 | Christensen.     |
| ii.   | US 4,882,779 | Rahtgen.         |
| iii.  | US 5,841,886 | Rhoads.          |
| iv.   | US 6,408,331 | Rhoads.          |
| v.    | US 6,456,984 | Demoff et al.    |
| vi.   | US 5,737,701 | Rosenthal et al. |
| vii.  | US 6,129,275 | Urquhart et al.  |
| viii. | US 4,851,651 | Gaucher.         |
| ix.   | US 5,949,046 | Kenneth et al.   |
| x.    | US 6,636,833 | Flitcroft et al. |
| xi.   | US 5,548,106 | Liang et al.     |

Art Unit: 2154


- xii. "DE LA RUE GIVES SINGAPORE THE 'MIDIS' TOUCH Singapore Immigration & Registration Department Chooses De La Rue Identity Systems to Provide Automated Passport Production System" Dec. 02, 1998
- xiii. "Cards & Personal Identification Technical Committee" July, 2000.
- xiv. US 2002/0070863 Brooking.
- xv. "Armed Services Commissary Regulations" (ASCR), James L. Elmer August 3, 1990.
- xvi. "European Committee for Banking Standards", January 1996.
- xvii. "Meal Card Program", Air Force Instruction 34-241, November 1, 1997.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chad Zhong whose telephone number is (703) 305-0718. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on 703-305-9678. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

CZ  
April 2, 2004

  
ZARNI MAUNG  
PRIMARY EXAMINER